

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 25, 2005. Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10-14. The present response amends claims 1-8 and 10-14, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-8 and 10-14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

1. Claims 1, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1, 10, and 12 have been amended to comply with the enablement requirement.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections with respect to these claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Martin, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105), referred to herein as *Martin*.

To anticipate a claim, every element of the claim must be disclosed within a single reference. *Martin* teaches “facilitating participation of mobile devices in accessing resources over a data network” (col. 2, line 34-36), which can be wireless, by providing “a mobile navigation metaphor to yield similar navigation experiences on both mobile devices and personal computers” (col. 2, line 38-39) and utilizing “a central content server to return requested content to requesters in a format suitable for their device” (col. 2, line 41-42). In other words, *Martin* teaches presenting customized data on a mobile device in similar manner as on PC using a pre-determined navigation metaphor, and such presentation can be characterized as “static” since the content data is limited to what has been stored in a single database on the server. In contrast, the present invention claims “detecting a content portion from the Web page data file”, “searching the content portion to identify one or more Web content data items”, and “displaying only the identified one or more Web content data items on a display of the mobile device” (independent claims 1, 10 and 11). In other words, it is a “dynamic” approach focusing on search, detection and identification of data items in ANY web page based on URL designated by the user in real time, rather than simply the presentation of stored static content in a pre-set format as in *Martin*. Therefore, *Martin* cannot anticipate the present invention as claimed in independent claim 1. Since claims 2 and 12-14 depend on claim 1, *Martin* cannot anticipate claims 1, 2 and 12-14 and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 3-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martin* in view of *De Boor* (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204), referred to herein as *Boor*.

The present application was filed on July 10, 2000, while *Boor* was filed more than two years later on Aug. 9, 2002, thus *Boor* does not qualify as a prior art against the present invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims 3-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

2. Claims 10, 11, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martin* in view of *Buckham et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,016), referred to herein as *Buckham*.

Prima facie obviousness rejection requires the Examiner to show that the prior art alone or in combination teaches or suggests all elements of the claimed invention. *Buckham* teaches improving the “availability and delivery of graphical location information regarding mobile resources” (col. 2, line 24-26), such as maps to “a client side of a data-enabled network interface” (col. 2, line 37-40). It does not teach either displaying such content on a mobile device having limited display space, or detecting/identifying content data items in a web page. Therefore, neither *Martin* nor *Buckham* can anticipate independent claims 1, 10, and 11 of the present invention. Since claims 6 and 8 depend on claim 1, *Martin* in view of *Buckham* cannot render claims 10, 11, 6, and 8 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/25/05

By: 
David T. Xue
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910